# **FISCAL NOTE**

Bill #: HB0376 Title: Permissive levies in counties with institutions of

higher education

Primary Sponsor: Olson, B Status: Second Reading

Sponsor signature		Chuck Swysgood, Budget Director Date	
Fiscal Summary		FY 2004 <u>Difference</u>	FY 2005 Difference
Expenditures: State Special Revenue		\$0 - \$4,734,085	\$0 - \$4,734,085
Revenue: State Special Revenue		\$0 - \$4,734,085	\$0 - \$4,734,085
Net Impact on General Fund Balance:		\$0	\$0
Significant Local Gov. Impact		r 🗵	Sechnical Concerns
☐ Included in the Executive Budget		Significant Long-Term Impacts	
Dedicated Revenue Form Attache	d	Needs to be included in HB 2	

# Fiscal Analysis

#### **ASSUMPTIONS:**

- 1. This fiscal note will not make an assumption as to whether county commissioners, will or will not levy the 6 mills as allowed by this bill.
- 2. It is assumed that the units of the university system are defined as the main campuses of a college or university. Using this definition, the counties impacted by this bill are: *Beaverhead, Cascade, Gallatin, Hill, Lewis and Clark, Missoula, Silver Bow, and Yellowstone.*
- 3. For those counties with more than one unit of the university system, it is assumed a single levy of 6 mills would be levied to support all the units in the county and not a levy of 6 mills for each unit.
- 4. Under current law (MCA 7-15-4286), all revenues generated from mill levies applied to the incremental taxable value of Tax Increment Financing Districts (TIFs), "except for the university system mills levied and assessed against property", are retained by the TIFs. For the purposes of this fiscal note it is assumed that the revenue generated by a new levy in support of the university system would be treated in the same manner as the university system mill levy.
- 5. The table below demonstrates the amount of revenue a 6-mill levy would generate in the affected counties.
- 6. These funds are statutorily appropriated.

# Fiscal Note Request HB0376, Error! Reference source not found. Amended in House Committee (continued)

FISCAL IMPACT: FY 2004 FY 2005

A 1	(D 0 1	11 0 14				
Amount of Revenue Generated by a 6 Mill Levy						
in Counties With Units of the University System						
Based on Tax Year 02 Taxable Values						
	County Taxable	Maximum	Amount			
County	Value TY02	Mill Levy	of Revenue			
Beaverhead	\$16,045,030	6	\$96,270			
Cascade	109,204,259	6	655,226			
Gallatin	133,978,575	6	803,871			
Hill	27,138,592	6	162,832			
Lewis and Clark	84,954,972	6	509,730			
Missoula	154,665,763	6	927,995			
Silver Bow	56,955,187	6	341,731			
Yellowstone	206,071,776	6	1,236,431			
	\$ 789,014,154		\$4,734,085			

Expenditures: Transfers	<u>Difference</u> \$0 - \$4,734,085	<u>Difference</u> \$0 - \$4,734,085			
<u>Funding of Expenditures:</u> State Special Revenue (02) CHE 5102	\$0 - \$4,734,085	\$0 - \$4,734,085			
Revenues: State Special Revenue (02) DoR 5801	\$0 - \$4,734,085	\$0 - \$4,734,085			
Net Impact to Fund Balance (Revenue minus Funding of Expenditures): State Special Revenue (02) \$0 \$0					

## EFFECT ON COUNTY OR OTHER LOCAL REVENUES OR EXPENDITURES:

This bill will require counties to make changes to their property tax accounting and reporting systems. Current local mill levies will see a slight decrease in non-levy revenue if the 6-mill levy is adopted.

### LONG-RANGE IMPACTS:

In FY 2006 and every year thereafter, the 6-mill levy would generate approximately \$4.7 million in revenue if levied in all affected counties.

### **TECHNICAL NOTES:**

The bill is not clear on how to classify the 6-mill levy with regard to tax increment financing districts. To ensure all the revenue from the 6-mill goes to the university system, 7-15-4286(2)(a) MCA should be amended so that revenue generated by the 6-mill levy in this bill is not paid to TIF districts.